DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 633 UD 017 136

AUTHOR Ellis, Ronald S.
TITLE Parent Orientation Program.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 44p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63424

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Attendance Patterns; Discipline Problems; Elementary Education; *Parent Education; *Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

This is an evaluation of the Parent Orientation Program. It was designed to: improve parental knowledge about school reading and mathematics requirements for their children; improve the performance of the parents in reading and mathematics through the evening adult program; and provide parents with school information via family workers. The program served 50 adults and 50 children for 63 days during the 1976 Spring term. On-site observations and questionnaires administered to parents on a pre and post test basis were used to evaluate the program. This evaluation report concluded that the Parent Orientation program did not improve the knowledge of parents concerning school requirements of their children nor did it improve the parents' performance in reading and mathematics. However, the family workers did provide parents with school information. It was concluded that late funding and the shortened duration of the program diminished the possible results of the program. Sample observation reports, questionnaires, reading and mathematics tests, and a family worker report are included in the appendix. (JP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142633

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 20-63424

PARENT ORIENTATION PROGRAM

June 1976

Prepared by

Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD017136

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Program	1
II.	Evaluative Procedures	4
III.	Findings	9
IV.	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	18
Appendix		
A.	Observation Reports	21
B.	Questionnaire to Measure Parents' Familiarity with Academic School Requirements Regarding Objective 1	28
C.	Questionnaire Measuring Achievement Level and Reading, Mathematics and Academic School Requirements	30
D.	Questionnaire Designed to Determine Kinds of Activities in Which Program Staff was Involved Regarding Objective 2	33
E.	Excerpts from a Typical Family Worker Report	35
F.	Report of Teacher and Teacher Aide of Evening Component	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Most Frequently Performed Functions of the Family Workers Listed in Order of Frequency 10

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

The Parent Orientation Program served 50 adults and 50 children during the Spring 1976 term. The adults were willing participants. Children willingly participated but were admitted into the program only with the consent of their parents. The participants were all selected from an area within Community School District 3, Manhattan, coinciding with the area serviced by the five schools which served as program component sites. With the exception of the adult classes, adults or children who participated in the program all did so upon the recommendation or referral of the school professional staff and/or various community agencies. Many of the adult evening class participants did so on their own initiative. Prior to selection for participation, participants were interviewed by a member of the program staff to assess their needs.

As a result of participation in the program, it was believed that parents would become familiar with the academic school requirements in reading, mathematics and other matters concerning their children's school such as attendance and discipline. Participation in the evening component of the program was expected to yield improvement for the participants in the areas of reading, mathematics and academic requirements for completion of the General Equivalency High School Diploma.

To accomplish these results, the program staff focused their activities in the following manner. The program was designed to perform the following functions as it attempted to meet the objectives stated above:

1. To provide Spanish-speaking community members with an opportunity to develop English-speaking skills;
2. To prevent pupils from dropping out of school in later years;
3. To involve parents in the educational process;
4. To provide assistance to parents with individual, community, and school-related problems.

It was expected that the program would be implemented in five of the schools within Community School District 3, Manhattan: PS 9, 84, 87, 166 and IS 44. This aspect of the program would occur between the hours of 8:30 AM and 3:30 PM. The evening adult classes were held in the community room of a multiple dwelling located at 74 West 92 Street on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings from 7 to 9 PM.

Within the total program, New York City "Umbrella Program" funds were used specifically for one Coordinator (Senior School Neighborhood Worker), one Teacher, five Family Workers, one Teacher Aide, and one Clerk-Typist. The specific activities engaged in by these persons will now be described.

Activities of the Staff Funded by School-Community Interaction Umbrella Program Funds

Program Coordinator (Senior School Neighborhood Worker). The program coordinator coordinated staff activities; prepared payroll; recruited and retained program participants; visited families at home; served as community agency-school liaison; served under supervision of school principal and Central Board of Education "Umbrella Office."

Teacher. The teacher taught English as a Second Language and other subjects to adults and teenagers; conducted instruction for General

Equivalency High School Diploma; conducted instruction for two hours per day on three days per week (i.e., Monday, Wednesday, Thursday evenings, 7 to 9 PM).

Teacher Aide. The teacher aide assisted the teacher in all duties.

Family Workers (5). The family workers conducted home visitations to check on absentees; served as liaison between the school and community agencies; served as liaison between the school and community agencies; served as interpreters where necessary; encouraged participation of parents in school life; identified family needs; accompanied family on visits to public and private agencies; assisted in recruitment and registration of children in program; escorted children to and from school where necessary; assisted teacher in classroom and performed related work.

Clerk-Typist. The clerk-typist typed correspondence; answered telephone; kept general records related to various program activities.

Although the project proposal states that the project was supposed to begin January 1, 1976 and continue until June 30, 1976, the program did not begin until April 27, 1976. The program was in operation for a total of 63 calendar days.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

On-site visits were made by the program evaluator and interviews were held on site with the program coordinator, the teacher, the teacher aide, the family workers and the clerk-typist. In addition, conferences were held with Central Board of Education School-Community Interaction Umbrella Program personnel.

To determine the effectiveness with which the evaluation objectives were attained with the total population of 295 subjects, the evaluator observed the program in operation on six separate occasions. Observation reports for the three observations of the evening adult program are appended (see Appendix A).

The objectives of the evaluation are:

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program improves on items related to academic school requirements in reading and mathematics as measured by a staff developed criterion referenced instrument.

For the determination of evaluation objective 1, questionnaires which measure parents' familiarity with academic school requirements were developed by the staff of the program. The instruments were validated by the staff with respect to the items incorporated within them. The instruments (see Appendix B for a sample instrument) were to be administered to the parents at the beginning of the session during which the topic covered in the questionnaire is discussed as a pretest and again toward the end of the program as a posttest.

Two major causal factors created problems which precluded the implementation of evaluation objective 1. The first major factor was late financing. Although the proposal requested funding for the period from January 1, 1976 to June 30, 1976, the program was not funded until April 27, 1976. As a result, a full complement of staff was not available. On May 4, 1976 only three of the five family workers had been hired, processed and working. There was no telephone service directly connected with the program. Furthermore, the clerk-typist and teacher aide were hired but still being processed and therefore unable to work.

The second major factor is related to the problems associated with the crisis in Community School District 3 regarding the parent takeover of the administration of the schools. As a result of this crisis, the program coordinator met with a great deal of difficulty in implementing her plans for the program. Some of the problems are listed below:

1. Administrative support (as called for in the project proposal) was unavailable to her during the first half of the implementation period. The school designated as the base site for the program was without a principal until mid-May 1976.

2. The use of instructional materials and the means of communication with parents in the community via the mechanism provided by the school was not available to the program director.

3. Parents' involvement with the problems associated with their own takeover of the schools precluded the program coordinator's communicating adequately with them in order to elicit their support.

4. As a result of poor communication, the parents did not demonstrate

any awareness of the program objectives.

5. Lack of administrative support and poor communication combined to restrict the dissemination of information about the program objectives to the parents and the community.

6. As of May 10, 1976, the new principal assigned to the school serving as the program office site claimed not to be aware of the program's existence insofar as his school is concerned. Moreover, according to the newly assigned principal, the district superintendent knew nothing of the program. This information was given to the program coordinator as a result of efforts to establish communication with the parents association of the school with the administrative support of the new principal.

7. As of May 10, 1976 the situation had not been resolved and the program coordinator was faced with the dilemma of how to implement the Parent Orientation Program workshops component within the schools.

Evaluation Objective 2: To determine if parents are acquiring school information as a result of their contacts with the family workers of the program as measured by worker report or rating instrument.

For the determination of evaluation objective 2, questionnaires which measure the kinds of activities in which each member of the program staff is engaged were administered to the program staff during conferences held with the consultant-evaluator. In addition, family worker reports were examined.

Evaluation Objective 3: To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled evening English instruction sessions improves on items related to reading, mathematics and academic

school requirements as measured by a criterion-referenced scale developed and administered by the program staff.

For the determination of evaluation objective 3, questionnaires which measure the program participants' achievement level in reading, mathematics and academic school requirements were developed by the staff of the program. The instruments were validated by the staff with respect to the items incorporated within them. The instruments (see Appendix C for a sample instrument) were to be administered to the program participants upon entry into the program as a diagnostic pretest and again toward the end of the program as a posttest.

Factors such as late funding, lack of administrative support, incomplete staffing, late recruitment efforts and poor communication mitigated against the development of a full fledged instructional program in sufficient time to enable the program staff to implement pre- and posttesting of the participants. Testing was done in English and mathematics only once toward the end of the program (June 24, 1976).

Evaluation Objective 4: To determine the extent to which the program as actually implemented coincides with the program as described and any subsequent modifications or addenda.

For the determination of evaluation objective 4, the evaluator-consultant made judgments based upon on-site visits and conferences held with the program staff and others associated with the program.

Although the evaluation design specifies that between January 1, 1976 and June 30, 1976 170 adults and 125 pupils would participate in the program, only 100 subjects (i.e., 50 adults and 50 children) were

involved by the time that the program got underway on April 27, 1976.

It is important to note here that there are a number of limitations that have been imposed upon the evaluation procedure. The program was not given notice of its funding allocation until April 27, 1976. As of May 10, 1976 only four of the nine program staff funded by the Central Board's "Umbrella Office" were processed and working in the program. Moreover, because of the policy differences between the Central Board of Education and the various alliances of parents and community affiliated organizations in Community School District 3, the program director was unable to establish the program's base site at PS 84.

After approximately five weeks of negotiation, a new site was designated at PS 166 for September 1976. Throughout the duration of the program (April 27, 1976 to June 30, 1976) the program functioned without adequate facilities for a base of operations. The program director worked under extreme hardship continuously, however, to implement whatever aspects of the program it was feasible to implement.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

Evaluation Objective 1

To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled sessions of the program improves on items related to academic school requirements in reading and mathematics as measured by a staff developed criterion referenced instrument.

Appendix B shows the criterion referenced instrument which was developed by the staff to determine whether or not evaluation objective 1 has been attained.

Because of insufficient time and resources this objective of the program was not implemented. Evaluation objective 1 cannot therefore be held to have been attained. The program was unable to establish a base of operation or a satisfactory working relationship with the schools in sufficient time to involve parents in the schooling process via such activities as school orientation workshops, school visitations, and involvement with parents associations and other school committees.

Evaluation Objective 2

To determine if parents are acquiring school information as a result of their contacts with the family workers of the program as measured by worker report or rating instrument.

Appendix D shows the questionnaire which was administered to all but one of the program staff. The questionnaire was designed to determine the kinds of activities in which the program staff was involved. In addition, family worker reports were examined. Table 1 below lists the tabulation of the responses to the question "List below the five (5)

Table 1

Most Frequently Performed Functions of the Family Workers
Listed in Order of Frequency

No. of Times Function Reported in Category	Description of the Category Using Typical Activities	Percent of Total Respondents[a] Reporting a Function in That Category
4	Examine attendance records; confer with teacher regarding behavior and attendance; determine reasons for absence via conferences with the child and with his parent/guardian	75
3	Relating to all children to confer with them where appropriate regarding their behavior or to help them to develop problem solving techniques	50
2	Assisting teacher in classroom or library	50
2	Escorting children home	50
2	Assisting in supervision of children in the playground	50
1	Clerical work in bookroom	25
1	Distributing working papers	25

[a]The questionnaire was answered by four of the five family workers.

most recurrent functions that you perform." In examining the table, the reader must bear in mind the following:

1. Not all family workers (only four of the five) responded to the questionnaire.

2. Some of the family workers had been working less than two weeks on the date that the questionnaire was administered (June 11, 1976) and therefore could only list one or two functions.

Examination of Table 1 indicates that the most frequently reported activity and the activity in which the largest proportion of the field staff (family workers) was involved, included providing information to parents about attendance and behavior requirements of the school.

Examination of the family worker reports yields repeated instances of the family worker bridging a communication gap between the school and the home (see Appendix E for excerpts from typical report). By simply making the parent aware of a requirement to be met or a procedure which, if followed, would be helpful for the child, the family workers performed useful service.

Family worker reports, however, do not reflect accurately the degree of involvement of the program. Their level of involvement may be much higher than their report indicates. In one instance, weekly records indicate that a total of 129 referrals involving children and 28 involving parents were handled within the period from May 3 to June 25, 1976. On the other hand, the list of separate names of participants served by the same program staff member for the same period reflects only 32 names of children and no names of parents. One possible interpretation is that some of the 32 names on the list were referred

more than once and some of the parents of the 32 children were involved in the action taken by the family worker in relation to the referral.

The responses to the questionnaire and the results of the examination of the family worker reports indicate that school information is being provided to parent participants serviced by the program staff. Evaluation objective 2 is therefore held to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 3

To determine if the performance of parents participating in 50% or more of the scheduled evening English instruction sessions improves on items related to reading, mathematics and academic school requirements as measured by a criterion referenced scale developed and administered by the program staff.

As indicated in Chapter II, the evaluation objective 3 was not carried out. Testing was conducted only once because insufficient time had passed by the end of the program to permit any significant gain to occur as the result of instruction. An examination of the results of the test given on June 24, 1976 (see Appendic C for examples of items included in the English and Mathematics examinations) indicates that considerable effort was being made by the participants to achieve mastery of the basic mathematics and English skills.

Classes in English and mathematics were held on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday between 7 P.M. and 9 P.M. from May 10, 1976 through June 28, 1976. According to the report (see Appendix F) of the teachers and teacher aide of the adult evening program class registration was estimated at 50. The registration list for the classes, however, reflects only 31 names.

The majority of the participants are of Hispanic origin. One participant is Cambodian. The age of the participants ranges from 20 to 65 years of age. On an average day, the attendance is approximately 15 adults. The attendance is, however, influenced by the size of the space allocation. The room currently in use is small.

In the class, group and individualized instruction is conducted in English as a Second Language and Mathematics. The levels of the students range from very little or no skills in English and Mathematics to preparation for the High School Equivalence Examination. (See Appendix A for Observation Reports.)

In addition to instruction in English and mathematics on at least three levels (slow, average and above average), the evening adult program provides cultural experiences for its participants. Twenty-one participants and five staff members attended the Puerto Rican Cultural Festival on June 10, 1976. The participants included the one Cambodian lady who attends the program, not only to improve her English, but also to learn Spanish.

There is no question that the evening adult classes have a positive influence on the total impact of the program. The classes provide help for adults and high school drop-outs in basic mathematics. Help is given to non-English speaking participants to improve their communication skills. Furthermore, the classes help to prepare participants for the High School Equivalency Examination and provide cultural enrichment experiences for the students.

Unfortunately, late funding and problems related to the strained

relationship between the Central Board and the community precluded the implementation that would permit the measurement of improvement in reading, mathematics and academic school requirements. Evaluation objective 3 cannot therefore be held to have been attained.

Evaluation Objective 4

To determine the extent to which the program as actually implemented coincides with the program as described and any subsequent modifications or addenda.

There is no question about the fact that the program staff of the Parent Orientation Program were attempting to service the needs of the participants. There was cooperation among the members of the staff. Although the relationship between the program and the schools got off to a poor start, there is evidence of an improving relationship between the program and the schools involved in the program within Community School District 3. Administrative support has been promised for September 1976. The program headquarters site is scheduled to be located at PS 166 instead of PS 84.

The positive effects of the program staff efforts were clearly apparent in the atmosphere of cooperation and diligence observed in the evening adult component and in the perseverence against serious handicaps on the part of the family workers in the daytime component. Although two of the five family workers and both teachers reported inadequate space, it is this evaluator's opinion that tremendous effort and many gains were made by the staff during the short time that the program was in operation.

In spite of the efforts of the program staff, there were a number of

discrepancies attributable to the late funding and administrative disorientation due to parent takeover of the program's base site school.

Because of the reduced period of implementation (approximately two months instead of six months) and administrative difficulties, the following discrepancies between the proposal and the implemented program were noted:

1. Recruitment of parent and pupil participants was not as extensive as expected.

2. Instruction in the evening component was not of long enough duration to provide measurable gains in English or mathematics.

3. Workshops with school personnel and parents about academic school requirements were not held within any of the schools associated with the program.

With the exception of the above stated discrepancies, this evaluator found that the program, as implemented, coincided with the program described in the proposal. The activities of the staff demonstrate active commitment to the accomplishment of program goals and objectives.

Recommendations made by the evaluator of the 1974-1975 academic year program (Function number 20-53424) were as follows:

1. While an attempt was made to statistically analyze the impact of the program through the use of teacher-made tests, the use of a standardized instrument with known reliability and validity would have been preferable.

2. As the program was designed to improve the basic language skills of program participants, the reasons for substitution of reading and mathematics measures for a measure of receptive and expressive language are not apparent to the evaluator. A workshop should be conducted at

the beginning of the project year for the project coordinator and his assistants at which training in the selection and use of appropriate standardized tests is given.

3. Methods utilized to advertise and inform potential participants of the availability of this program should be expanded in order that the community be aware of its services.

4. Much more effort should be made to recruit parents. The numbers of participants should be increased in order to justify the continued existence of the program.

5. The physical plant should be enlarged and improved, and tighter security made available if the program is to be successful.

6. On the basis of the suggestive evidence for objective 1 and the site visits made for the discrepancy analysis, it is recommended that the program be recycled.

In the current program, standardized tests were not utilized for the same reason that workshops at which training in the selection and utilization of appropriate standardized tests were not held. There was insufficient time. Furthermore, lack of time precluded the implementation of an adequate system for advertisement and recruitment of participants into the program.

Taking into account the reduced time, the number of participants in this year's program compares favorably with the number serviced in last year's program. There were 50 adults and 50 children services this year as opposed to 70 persons who voluntarily participated in the evening program and an unspecified number in the community for whom the program

provided services during the day.

The site of the evening component for the program was again the same as in the previous year. It is the understanding of this evaluator that although a new location was identified it was not possible to secure it in time to implement the evening component of the program there.

Although the program was recycled, it is the opinion of this evaluator that more than two months were required to enable the coordinator and program staff to effectively implement all of the recommendations of last year's evaluation report.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Parent Orientation Program has not met its first objective to improve the knowledge of parents about the academic school requirements in reading and mathematics for their children or its third objective to improve the performance of its adult participants in reading, mathematics and academic school requirements. During the period of implementation, there were some discrepancies between the program as it was implemented and the program as described in the project proposal. Late funding and administrative disorientation were major factors in diminished recruitment, shortened duration of implementation, and the lack of any workshops with school personnel and parents about academic school requirements.

The program did, however, meet its second objective to provide parents with school information via their contact with the program field staff (family workers). Furthermore, with the exception of the above stated discrepancies, the program met its fourth objective to implement the program in the manner described in the project proposal. The program staff serviced the needs of the participants and demonstrated effective cooperation toward meeting the program goals. Program staff efforts coincided with the program staff activities described in the project proposal.

This evaluator concludes that, even though only two of the evaluation objectives have been attained, the program has certainly been worthwhile. The program staff provided individual attention to adults attempting to improve their skills in reading and mathematics and thereby provided

for upward mobility. The family workers helped the schools to provide for gaps in services. In addition, they provided emergency assistance to children and parents and helped to remove the language barrier between parents and the schools through their translation services.

In addition to the specific recommendations to follow, this evaluation recommends that the program be continued.

1. The administrative problems which occurred during the first half of the implementation period might be minimized in subsequent cycles if workshops are held which include, among others, the coordinator, the school administrators of the district and Central Board of Education personnel. At such workshops the administrative structure and policies of the schools could be discussed and ideas about promoting smooth implementation of program goals could be shared.

2. Steps should be taken to ensure that each program staff member has an adequate work area adequately equipped which includes the use of telephone service. This would ensure more efficient use of program staff time and establish the privacy required for servicing the needs of program participants.

3. The problem of inadequate space for the evening adult education program can be overcome either by acquiring a larger space for the classes or by adding three additional sections on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday from 5 PM to 7 PM and maintaining the section size at 10 to 15 participants.

4. As an aid to recruiting more participants, the amount of instructional time could be increased and additional classes in subjects such as typing, consumer education, and cultural trips be offered. Workshops

involving parents, children and community agencies on topics such as housing, health, social services and education could be presented as well.

5. During the subsequent cycle meetings should be planned between school supervisory personnel and parent participants to review the requirements for their children's success in areas such as reading, mathematics, etc.

Appendix A: OBSERVATION REPORTS

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: May 10, 1976 School: 74 West 92 Street, lobby room

Project title: Parent Orientation Program--BE 20-63424

Class: Classroom Room: Lobby floor Time: From 7 PM to 9 PM

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Raymond Burgos

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

The period was spent registering students and giving a brief overview to small groups. Approximately 16 students registered. Students came as a result of phone calls which they received from the coordinator, Mrs. Martinez.

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

No lesson was conducted.

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

Students asked questions about the nature of the class. They were told that it would be necessary for them to work hard and complete their assignments in order to derive full benefit from the instruction.

Method of instruction used:

It was indicated to the students that instruction in English would stress the development of skills in conversation.

Description of materials used by staff:

Materials available included books, work texts. The instructor stated that he planned to use some audio-visual material such as film strips and the overhead projector.

Description of materials used by pupils:

Some students brought notebooks and pens or pencils. The instructor stated that texts would be provided for the students once the classes began. Number of teacher aides in room: 0.

There was no teacher aide. Processing is not complete. The aide cannot begin work until all personnel processing is complete.

What was teacher's major role?

The teacher's major role was explaining the scope of the work to be covered in the adult evening sessions.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.):

Approximately 16 persons came to register and obtain a course overview.

Is the program operational?

The evening component of the Parent Orientation Program is just getting started. The program was funded much later than requested.

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

Students are being enrolled in the evening adult education component of the program.

Identify:

Strengths--Participants relate well to instructor. Instructor is bilingual (Spanish-English). Program coordinator and instructor are supportive of participants and encourage to participate for self-improvement.

Weaknesses--Recruitment is slow. The space is small.

Recommendations:

Access to telephone service and duplicating services should be made easier for program staff. Larger space should be provided.

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: May 13, 1976 School: 74 W. 92 Street, Lobby room

Project title: Parent Orientation Program--BE 20-63424

Class: Classroom Room: Lobby floor Time: From 7 PM to 9 PM

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Raymond Burgos

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

The class time was spent in reviewing English vocabulary.

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

Pupils contributed to the review by discussing (in English and Spanish) the meanings of the words being considered. Mr. Burgos introduced the concept of using the prefix, suffix and roots of the words as a basis for deciphering the meaning.

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

Pupils all attended to the discussion. In addition, they freely asked questions concerning the material of the teacher and of each other.

Method of instruction used:

Some group instruction occurred. However, most of the instruction was individualized and occurred in the periods between the group discussion about the group of words under consideration.

Description of materials used by staff:

The General Equivalency Diploma text published by Arco was used by the teachers and the students.

Description of materials used by pupils:

In addition, participants used notebooks and pens or pencils.

Number of teacher aides in room: none.

The teacher was not processed as yet and therefore cannot work.

What was teacher's major role?

The teacher set the exercises for the class, led the discussion in English and Spanish and helped each student individually between group discussions of the assignment.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.): 7

Is the program operational? Yes

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

Instruction is being conducted in the development of participant skills in conversational English.

Identify:

Strengths--Individual attention. High degree of enthusiasm on the part of the teacher. Bilingual instruction for Spanish dominant students.

Weaknesses--Not enough parents. More participants needed. Teacher aide is needed since students are at different levels.

Recommendations:

Recruitment efforts should be stepped up. Teacher aide processing should be stepped up. More strategies should be applied to get at the different developmental levels of the students.

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

Date: June 2, 1976 School: 74 W. 92 St., lobby room

Project title: Parent Orientation Program--BE 20-63424

Class: Classroom Room: Lobby floor Time: From 7 PM to 9 PM

Name of teacher in charge: Mr. Raymond Burgos

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper or other side to insure complete reporting.

Content theme of lesson observed:

The following subjects were covered: Reading, mathematics, English as a second language. For English (reading) the teacher asked the students to read a story twice. He then discussed the story with them and asked questions designed to check their understanding of what they had read.

Cognitive response of pupils to lesson:

Students were divided into three small groups during the English period. One group worked with the teacher in English as a second language. The coordinator, also present, worked individually with one student to help the student to perfect the skills of writing. A third group worked with the teacher aide using a text.

Affective response of pupils to lesson:

Students were all involved. The atmosphere was informal, yet all students worked seriously. Some children were present. They worked with their parents or watched quietly.

Method of instruction used:

Mainly individualized instruction was employed. The students worked with the text and the teacher. The teacher drilled and asked questions that required students to apply what they were learning.

Description of materials used by staff:

Blackboard and chalk; Cowles GED Program; General Mathematical Ability by Jules Burstein; Curso completo de engles by Robert J. Dixson.

Description of materials used by pupils:

Texts, notebooks, pencils.

Number of auxiliaries, personnel, in room: 2

(1) Teacher aide; (2) Program coordinator.

Describe auxiliary personnel activity:

The program coordinator gave individual instruction to a student learning to write. The teacher aide worked with the text and a small group of students (approximately three).

What was teacher's major role?

The teacher carried out a supportive role. In addition to maintaining the pace of the instructional activities, the teacher occasionally digressed to provide additional motivation by talking with students about issues which were of concern to them.

Number of participants (i.e., students, children, subjects, etc.):

Nine adults; two children

Is the program operational? Yes.

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

Instruction was being carried out in three areas in the manner described in the proposal.

Identify:

Strengths--Individual instruction. Intensive work with students who required it. Instruction in English and Spanish. Program component

serves student needs.

Weaknesses--Not enough students. Children should have been more directly involved in the instruction. Children were well behaved but bored. Space seemed crowded even with only 12 persons present.

Recommendations:

Continued efforts should be made to recruit more students. Instruction should be devised to service children who cannot be left at home or with a baby sitter. A larger space should be acquired for the evening adult classes.

Appendix B: QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE PARENTS' FAMILIARITY WITH ACADEMIC SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS REGARDING OBJECTIVE 1

Reading Questionnaire

Ms. Nicanora Martinez, Program Coordinator Name of Parent_____

Directions: Write answers on the reverse side of this sheet and fill in the blank for item number 9.

1. How can you tell if your child is a good reader?
2. What is your child's reading level?
3. Where can you go in the school to learn your child's reading level?
4. State two reasons that it is important to read well and have a high reading level.
5. What can you and your child do to increase your child's reading level?
6. What resources are available in the community to help your child to improve his reading?
7. What resources are available in the school to help your child improve his reading?
8. What resources are available in your home to help your child improve his reading?
9. A student who graduates from elementary (intermediate) school will receive a

   a. _____ if he reads less than _____ reading grade

   b. _____ if he reads less than _____ reading grade but more than _____ reading grade

   c. _____ if he reads _____ reading grade or more

10. What additional steps can you take to encourage your child to improve his reading?

Mathematics Questionnaire

Ms. Nicenora Martinez, Program Coordinator Name of Parent_____

Directions: Write answers on the reverse side of this sheet.

1. How can you tell if your child is good in math?
2. What is your child's math level?
3. Where can you go in the school to learn your child's math level?
4. State two reasons that it is important to have a high math level and do well in math.
5. What topics are included in the mathematics program in your child's school?
6. List five ways that you can help your child in mathematics even if you do not understand it yourself.
7. What everyday opportunities can you use to allow your child to use numbers and solve problems in natural situations?
8. Give two examples of how you can help your child to learn to use mathematics in the following situations:
   a. in the home
   b. at the supermarket
   c. in the car
   d. reading the newspapers
   e. playing games
9. Explain the relationship, if any, that a given math level has upon the type of diploma or certificate that your child will receive when he graduates from elementary (intermediate) school.
10. What additional steps can you take to encourage your child to improve his mathematics skills?

Appendix C: QUESTIONNAIRE MEASURE ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL AND READING, MATHEMATICS AND ACADEMIC SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS

I. Addition:

1. 62
   + 40

II. Find the missing numbers:

1. 3 + n = 11 n = _____

2. n + 8 = 11 n = _____

III. Write the correct sign on the line

< means less than (menos)
> means more than (mas)
= means is equal to

1. 7 + 3 ____ 6 + 5

2. 5 + 4 ____ 6 + 7

IV. Multiplication

1. 15
   x 3

V. Fill in the blanks below:

1. 8 x ____ = 56

VI. Division:

1. $8\overline{)40}$

VII. Division:

Fill in the blanks below.

1. 56 ÷ 8 = ____

VIII. Fractions:

Change each improper fraction to a mixed number.

1. $\frac{11}{6}$ = _____

2. $\frac{25}{7}$ = _____

3. $\frac{21}{6}$ = _____

IX. Fractions:

Change each improper fraction to amixed number or a whole number.

1. $\frac{15}{12}$ = _____

2. $\frac{18}{6}$ = _____

X. Adding fractions:

Find the least common denominator. Write the sums in lowest terms.

1. $2\ 1/3$
   $+\ 5\ 1/2$

XI. Change each fraction to a percent.

1. $1/3$ = %

XII. Optional

1. $m + 2$
   $m + 3$

English Review Test

I. List any 25 vocabulary words that you have studied or learned.

II. Give the definition of any five of the following words:

1. Democratic Party--
2. Republican Party--
3. politics--
4. donkey--
5. elephant--
6. nominate--
7. delegates--
8. candidate--
9. election--
10. language--

III. Think of the words which you know the meaning of (definition) and write them with the definition (example: candidate: is a person who runs for an elected public office).

IV. In English, give your opinion of your English class (pros and cons). Note: The teacher will give instructions on this question for student understanding and clarification.

Appendix D: QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNED TO DETERMINE KINDS OF ACTIVITIES IN WHICH PROGRAM STAFF WAS INVOLVED REGARDING OBJECTIVE 2

Directions: Please answer all questions below. Where space has been provided for an answer, be as specific and detailed as possible. The reverse side of the sheet may be used for additional comments. Where boxes have been provided, please check all that apply to you or your location.

Project name_____

Your name_____

Title_____

Location_____

1. I have seen the specific objectives of this project. (check one) ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. I feel the specific objectives of the project have been met. ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. The three most outstanding characteristics which make this project component unique (not good or bad, just different) are: _____

4. List below (and on the reverse, if necessary) the five (5) most recurrent functions that you perform. _____

5. How many students do you service in an average week? _____
   Do you service them directly or indirectly? ☐ Direct ☐ Indirect
   Please explain. _____

6. In terms of what is required to meet the project objectives, I have been provided with adequate:

   a. materials and equipment ☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. space ☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. time ☐ Yes ☐ No
   d. professional assistance ☐ Yes ☐ No
   e. other _____ ☐ Yes ☐ No

   Please explain your response above in greater detail (e.g., what materials would you like to have? etc.).

7. The students which I service in the project are (have been) selected according to the following criteria. _____

_____

8. Considering the project objectives and the kinds of activities that the objectives imply, the use to which I have been able to put my time was (is) reasonable. ☐ Yes ☐ No
Please explain. _____

_____

9. The objectives which I have listed on the reverse side of this sheet beginning at the top are those which I feel are important and have not been met by the project.

10. In the space provided (below and on the reverse side) state what improvements could enable this project to meet the objectives which you feel are important (regardless of whether they have been met by the project or not). _____

_____

Appendix E: EXCERPTS FROM A TYPICAL FAMILY WORKER REPORT

June 1976

The following is a description of my duties as a Family Assistant. Most of my time is spent serving as a liaison between parents and the school. As a liaison, I am responsible for the following:

1. Speaking with problem students and notifying parents of their problems.
2. Making home visits to parents who do not respond to letters from school.
3. Referring parents to outside agencies for assistance, and occasionally accompanying them when needed.
4. Meeting (once per week) with a psychologist from an outside agency to discuss problem students.

Another one of my functions is that of assisting the attendance teacher. I check the roll books each morning to determine the number of students absent (excessive) and I follow up by sending cards to their homes. I also fill out forms for the attendance teacher in case further administrative action is necessary.

Finally, I tutor students in reading and math. The tutoring sessions are one hour in duration and occur on Mondays through Thursdays.

Log for a Typical Week

Day 1	A.M.	Check roll books, fill out forms, tutoring four students
	P.M.	Speak with problematic students, write letters, escort and refer parents.
Day 2	A.M.	Check roll books, fill out forms, tutoring of the same
	P.M.	Speak with problem students, write letters, escorting and refer parents

Day 3	A.M.	Check roll books, fill out forms
	P.M.	Same as above
Day 4	A.M.	Check roll books, fill out forms, tutoring of four students. Meet with outside agency psychologist.
	P.M.	Meet parents group and outside agency psychologist, home visits
Day 5	A.M.	Check roll books, fill out forms. Tutoring four students.
	P.M.	Speak with problematic students, write letters, escort parents, refer parents, etc.

The following is a statistical report on the number of parents and students serviced from May 3, 1976 to June 25, 1976. Approximately, this report is based on the number of people served on a weekly basis.

	Number of Students Served			Total
5/ 3-5/ 7/76	7 (behavior)	2 (tutor)	(each day)	15
5/10-5/14/76	5 (behavior)	2 (tutor)	(each day)	13
5/17-5/21/76	4 (behavior)	2 (tutor)	(each day)	12
5/24-5/28/76	6 (behavior)	4 (tutor)	(each day)	22
5/31-6/ 4/76	6 (behavior)	4 (tutor)	(each day)	22
6/ 7-6/11/76	5 (behavior)	4 (tutor)	(each day)	21
6/14-6/18/76	0 (behavior) (graduation)	4 (tutor)	(2 days only)	8
6/21-6/25/76	7 (behavior)	3 (tutor)		16
	Number of Parents Served			
4/28-6/25/76	Home visits			6
	P.A. meetings			7
	Meetings with parents and principal regarding different problems			15

Record Keeping

A card is filled out whenever a student is referred to me regardless of problem. It contains the following:

a. Name and address

b. Name of parents

c. Date

d. Complete description of problem

e. Follow up

Appendix F: REPORT OF TEACHER AND TEACHER AIDE OF EVENING COMPONENT

Coordinator: Mrs. Nicanora Martinez

Teacher: Mr. Raymond Burgos

Teacher-aide or educational assistant: Mr. Jose Ramós

I. Class Schedule and Time Period

A. Classes in English and mathematics began on May 10, 1976 through June 28, 1976.

B. English and math classes meet every Monday, Wednesday and Thursday between 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

II. Class Registration and Average Attendance

A. As of June 24, 1976, class registration is estimated at 50 with age groups ranging from 20 to 65 years of age.

B. Average attendance is about 15; but consideration must be taken into account in reference to space allocation which is limited.

Added note: The groups of 15 which make up the daily attendance are working effectively and progressively within the space allocation; but the number registered would be equalized with attendance if more space allocation was extended or granted. This is the firm belief of the P.O.C. staff and parents.

III. Curriculum Materials

A. English

1. English as a second language textbook, Levels 2 and 3 by Finkel and Krawitz.

2. Curso Complet de Ingles by Robert J. Dixson.

3. Vocabulary words and idiomatic expression from Commonly Used American Idioms by Weiner.

4. English as a conversation with the use of slides, pictures and "experiential" materials such as TV at home assignments and magazine reading and descriptiveness.

5. Dialogue readings and practical dialogue usage between the students themselves.

B. Mathematics

1. The High School Equivalency Manual Book is used for students who will be taking the High School Equivalency tests.

2. "Mimeoed" materials made up by P.O.C. staff in addition, subtraction, division and multiplication; also in the areas of basic algebraic problem solving.

IV. Teacher Objectives and/or Job Tasks

A. English

1. The teaching of English as a second language to non-English speaking students who are in general Hispanic. (Note: We also have one Cambodian lady as a student.)

2. Teaching English as a "tool" for daily communicative experience with the "inside" and "outside" world (in essence, learning English for usage in the surrounding vicinity [inside] and at work [outside]).

3. Group and individual teaching of English. In general, we have been working with three to five groups and/or individual during the course of each period between May 10 to present.

4. Teaching English with the use of colorful and visual materials. Descriptive English in which student can associate object and symbols for English-language communication.

5. Teaching English which is compatible to the everyday life of the individual and the overall group (example: shopping, asking for directions, filling out employment application, questions to ask in hospital, etc.).

6. Teaching of English in order to prepare certain students for the High School Equivalency test.

B. Mathematics

1. Teaching math to prepare students for High School Equivalency Test (e.g., problem in word problem solving, algebraic problems and geometric problems).

2. Teaching math as a "tool" for daily living (e.g., shopping, savings and checking account balance).

3. As in English, mathematics is taught with group-individual emphasis; however, to date we have three predominant groups. They are slow, average and above average.

4. Teaching with the usage of individual and group work-- the following text: Guidebook to Mathematics by Blanche Laughlin.

Summary

In general, the greatest asset which the Parents Orientation Adult Program has is its students, the parents and grandparents of many "schooled"-age children. The number that are registered can validate this opinion and/or premise.

As stated previously, the program is functioning better than can be expected under the space allocation provided; however, expansion of the program seems feasible (if funds can be provided) due to the number of interested students and the need for an extended time span of teaching course-material which is an important part of the students' life in and out of the home.